

The Principia
Published Weekly, for the PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATION
at No. 104 William Street, near John St.
Rev. WILLIAM GOODALE, Editor.
Rev. G. B. CHURCH, D. D., Editors.
J. W. ALDEN, Publisher.
Terms: Two Dollars a Year, in Advance.
Two Dollars and fifty cents if payment be delayed
six months.
Fifty cents a year in addition for the paper delivered
by carrier within Brooklyn or New York.
Advertisements—Ten cents a line for each inser-
tion, payable in advance.
Advertisements amounting to
\$20.00 25 per cent discount.
\$40.00 50 " "
\$60.00 75 " "
\$80.00 and upwards, 50 " "
Notices.—All religious and other notices will be
charged ten cents a line for each insertion.
Letters directed to Rev. WILLIAM GOODALE, Editor,
or Rev. G. B. CHURCH, must be subscribed with
our Post-Office box 4881, or we shall be subjected to
additional postage.
All checks or drafts should be made payable to
"J. W. ALDEN or order," and all remittances and
business communications directed to
"J. W. ALDEN, Publisher,
Box 4881, New York."

THE WAR POWER AS ORDAINED OF GOD.

AND THE GUILT AND CONSEQUENCES OF DOING THE
WORK OF THE LORD DECEITFULLY.

Discourse by REV. DR. CHURCH, in the Senate
Chamber in Washington.
Romans, 13, 4. and Jer. 48, 10.—But if thou do that
which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword
in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger,
to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.
Jeremiah 48: 10.—Cursed be he that doeth the
work of the Lord deceitfully, he shall be cut off from
his sword from blood.

Part III.

THE GUILT AND CONSEQUENCES OF DOING THE
WORK OF THE LORD DECEITFULLY.

We have already entrenched upon the pro-
vince of our fourth point of discourse. The
iniquity designated in this case is first, that of
taking the sword unjustly, that of assuming and
exercising the right of employing it, in other
words, that of making war,—for any other pur-
pose than the purpose of God, the cause of right-
eousness and justice, the protection of the in-
nocent, and the restraint and punishment of the
viciously wicked. The curse of the Almighty
rests upon any war, the object of which is any
other than justice.

Then, second, there is the iniquity of sparing
any crime or criminal, or sin, against which God
directs the sword to be used, the iniquity of a
misplaced and treacherous tenderness towards
the criminal, or of any covenant entered into, or
compromise, tolerating his sin, as in the case of
Saul and Agag, and of Ahab and Benhadad.
When God commands the execution of his law
by war, then, whatsoever your hand findeth to
do, do it with your might; and cursed be he that
for friendship for the rebel and the sin, keepeth
back his sword from blood.

Now, there is no doubt that we have greatly
offended God in the very measures we have adopt-
ed, as well as in what we have left undone. We
have equipped with slavery from the beginning.
The Jews had a saying that in every one of their
sins and of God's judgments there was an ounce
of the powder of the golden calf. In all our measures
there is a dishonest tincture of the Babylonian
garment and the golden wedge, and the curse of
Achan is the consequence. We have dared to
assume as a principle before God that loyalty
entitled a man to practise slavery; loyalty to our-
selves entitled a man to disobey God, in the very
article because of which God's judgments are
blazing against us. This is a dreadful contem-
nation of our cause, and exasperation of our wicked-
ness.

HALF-WAY MEASURES UNJUST.

But the same treachery towards justice, and
tenderness towards the rebels and their slavery,
has made us take the life and power out of our
very bills for the execution of the penalties of
treason. For example, in the confiscation act, we
have rendered it null and void by restricting its
operation to the life-time of the rebel owner. A
rebel in arms against this nation owns a planta-
tion. His children remain on it, and work it, and
he fights. If he dies, your confiscation act secures
his property to his children. What better life
insurance could he desire? You reserve his
landed estate for his children, assuming that they
are the rightful possessors of it, and that it cannot
be turned aside from such entail, thus constituting
a landed slave-aristocracy, by virtue of the rebel-
lion, the sacredness of whose possessions the Uni-
ted States Government endorses and insures, on
the pretence that it is unjust that any penalty
should descend from the parent to the family!

Now look at our own contradictory practice
regard the poor slaves. There you suffer the
attainder to descend from parent to child, not
penalty indeed, but the infamous brand of
slavery; and if any one presumes to infringe the
justice of that procedure, and that you are bound
to break it up and forbid it,—oh, you regard that
as a piece of hypercriticism, a pressing of a prin-
ciple or rule to an application never intended!

By torture of one and the same article in your
Constitution, you can secure to the children of a
rebel father the possession of his estate, on the
ground that it belongs to them, under the article
forbidding attainder; and at the very same time,
in spite of the same article, you condemn and
curse the children of the slave to the inheritance
of the parent's slavery, on the ground that attain-
der of blood for the purpose of perpetuating sla-
very is a privilege belonging by slave law to the
slave aristocracy, and is no attainder at all!

Can you imagine that a just God will endure
this? That God will suffer you to reserve into
the bosom of your own statute law the brand
mark of slaveholding and man-stealing cruelty,
partus sequitur ventrem, the most detestable form
of attainder ever put in execution among men,
in defiance not only of God's law, but of your own
Constitution forbidding attainder, while at the
same time you execute yourselves from enacting
the penalties of treason against the slaveholding
rebels, on the pretence that the prohibition of
attainder prevents it? Do you think that God
will let you shield the children of slaveholders in
rebellion, and bestow the estates of their rebel
fathers upon them, and at the same time brand
the children of the poor slaves with the curse of
slavery by attainder of blood?

It is doing the work of the Lord deceitfully,
when we thus, from lingering tenderness towards
a great sin, refuse to execute God's law and jus-
tice against it, and refuse to restore its victims to
their rights. Every individual and every family
detained in slavery by our co-operation and com-
plicity, is by us kidnapped, and we are the slave-
holding government, and the continuance of men-
stealing from generation to generation is by us
provided for, in a vast and monstrous bill of at-
tainder, constituting a race of slaves, every one of
whom has, by our own Constitution as well as by
the Divine Law, the same perfect right to free-
dom that we have.

LUNATIC THEOLOGY AND POLICY.

From this survey of the nature of the war
power as God's appointed power of justice, we
see the madness and wickedness of those who
have affirmed and who will that justice cannot
be made the object of the war, that there is
for the sake of justice, and therefore that the
President has no right to make justice to the en-
slaved an object, or to emancipate the slaves as
an act of justice.

This is a glaring instance of doing the work
of the Lord deceitfully. There are even ministers
of the gospel, who, in their fanaticism on this
subject have gone so far as to affirm from the

The Principia

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. III.—NO. 51. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1863. WHOLE NO. 155.

Pulpit that we could not fight for justice, could
not justly administer justice, as any aim of the
war, especially towards those who have always
been deprived of justice; and that the Presi-
dent, if he had undertaken to administer the
war for the purpose of redressing the wrongs
of these subjects of the United States Govern-
ment, would have been almost as great a traitor to
the Constitution as the rebels themselves.

Such theology is worthy of Bedlam than of a
Christian pulpit, and such ministers would be
better employed in preaching in a lunatic asylum,
than endeavouring to convert men to such lunacy.
Nay, it has not the excuse of lunacy; it is im-
pious, carrying the nation, under such teaching, to ruin.

For mark you, even if there had been any par-
ticle of truth in the allegation that the President
could not appoint emancipation as an object of the
war, it was in the power of Congress, from the
outset, to have enacted emancipation and the pro-
tection of the enslaved, and to have put that
among the articles of war, binding both the Presi-
dent and the Generals and the whole army
with them, to its execution. If there had been
no authority in the Constitution to make war for
justice, there was ample authority lodged by the
Constitution in Congress to do this; and Congress
ought to have done it, and to have constrained
the President and the army to execute this right-
eous will; and had they done this, the rebellion
would have been ended, long ago.

And because they have not done this, but de-
nied and refused justice, and laid down the doc-
trine that we could not enact justice for justice
sake, and for God and humanity, but must put it
off as the last dire necessity, and even when sub-
mitted to, must enact and execute just a little of
justice as possible; and if possible bring back the
rebels to submission by permitting the practice of
injustice as a privilege, and guaranteeing it to
them as a right; therefore the wrath of the Al-
mighty has been upon us; disaster and defeat
have waited on us; the war power, perverted by
us from its only righteous end, has been turned
by the Almighty against us; we have sown the
wind and reaped the whirlwind. For God will
always lay his curse upon a people, who pervert
this most sacred and awful power of government
committed by him for the purpose of justice, into
selfishness and injustice. He will blast the nation
the government, the people, who dare assert their
authority to make war, and yet deny the author-
ity to execute justice, and who dare resort to war
for any other object than justice. And if both
parties are doing this, then he will blast both
parties.

If war is for justice, and no other war is per-
mitted of God, then justice ought to be pursued
in it, with the whole energy of government
and people, and it is doing the work of the Lord
deceitfully to do it half way, or to suffer the war
to languish and be protracted for want of a whole
heart in the policy of freedom and justice. It is
doing the work of the Lord deceitfully to attempt
to make war on peace principles, or to conclude it
by a compromise of principle.

THE WAR POWER A POWER OF JUSTICE ONLY.

The war power is a power of government deriv-
ed from God, not from the Constitution, not de-
pendent on the Constitution. If there were no
written Constitution in existence the war power
would not be less an element of the govern-
ment, when its peace powers are resisted. When
that is the case, justice must be maintained, and, if
necessary, war must be waged; and when war is
waged, every thing must go down before it, until
obedience to the government under its peace pow-
ers is restored. Justice is the highest attribute
of the sword, its authority, its justification. It
has no other authority. Government itself has
no authority but that of justice, no right but that
of justice, nor any power given to it from God,
but for the sake of justice. It is not the war-
power that authorises us to do justice, but it is
justice that authorises us to use the war-power.

When the sword becomes necessary, and gov-
ernment must strike with it, then all the peace
powers of government used to exercise through
the agencies of law and courts, it concentrates
against the rebellion into the arm of that power,
without any intermediary processes. When the
sword becomes necessary, and the Executive must
use it, then all the powers of government are
flung into it, and the Commander-in-Chief must
strike the blow. And as the blow is struck, because
all the other powers of government, are resisted, so
no statute can for a moment be permitted to come
between the blow and the rebel. No power of
delay, no plea of ordinary right, or right however
constitutional and unquestioned in a time of peace,
or of obedience to government, can shield the
rebel, or be permitted to interpose to soften the
blow and save him from destruction. Whatever
stands in the way of the blow must be swept out
of the way. Whatever is necessary to be re-
moved that you may get at the rebels and sweep
them down with the cannon of the government,
must be removed.

DECEITFULLY IS INHUMANITY.

And then again, note this, as the meaning of
the text with the curse against doing the war-
work of the Lord deceitfully, and keeping back
the sword from blood, that war is beneficent, just
in proportion to its swiftness and destructiveness;
its efficacy depends on its destructiveness; it
not tenderness towards man, but treachery
against God, to attempt to wage it on peace prin-
ciples. A just war can be justly waged, only
when it is waged with the whole power of the
government, to make it short and decisive, with
submission to justice as the only condition of peace.

War waged mildly is unjustly and inhumanly
waged. It ought to be waged in earnest for en-
tire and swift subjugation, or not at all. The
pretence that war is a measure friendly to the
rebels, that our generals and our armies are sent
forth to them that our object is to protect their
rights, is an absurdity never witnessed under hea-
ven, until here in the United States; and here it
never would have been witnessed, had it not been
that the right which the rebels are contending
is the right of human slavery. And that is the
right which our government and our generals
have assured the rebels that we were bound to
protect, and knew too well the duties of our holy
religion not to protect, or to suffer any insurrec-
tion against it. Did heaven ever witness such
madness?

And when at length we have felt compelled to
renounce this protection of slavery, and to threat-
en the emancipation of the slaves, we have apolo-
gized for it, as if, instead of being a virtue
it were a crime, as if it were the most terrible
severity and injustice, instead of being an act of
justice and humanity. We have entreated par-
don, as for some great outrage, into which we
were driven by inexorable necessity for self-pre-

servation, having otherwise no right to have
resorted to it. As if the desolations and miseries
of war, its battles and carnage, were mild pro-
cesses in comparison with this measure of justice
and humanity, this gift of liberty to the enslaved,
we must try all murderous measures first, at a
sacrifice of two hundred thousand lives, before
resorting to the use of justice and mercy, per-
missible only as an ultimate necessity. All the
demonic elements of war were summoned and
relayed upon, and deemed Constitutional, rather
than the edict of freedom, the proclamation of
benevolence and justice.

This measure, which God commanded at the
outset, was denounced and forbidden to the last,
because, as it was pretended, we could not act
justly, could not constitutionally exercise justice,
under the war-power. The insane opinion has
been maintained, that justice was guaranteed
and secured in the Constitution as the privilege
and property of the rebels, and that slave-prop-
erty was the most sacred of all properties, and
that we ought to avoid striking it as long as pos-
sible, and that when we struck it we must not strike
in the name of justice, but only in the name and
by the right of war; for in the method of justice
we had no right to strike at slavery, and it was
opportunity so to strike, and once at war, we
ought to do as much mischief as possible to our
enemy, as a military necessity, in order to con-
quer him. But being a measure of justice to the
enslaved it was unconstitutional as such, and
must be disavowed as such, and urged as a mea-
sure that only war could give the right to take!

Such reasoning is so immoral, and the position
assumes our Constitution to be so essentially un-
just, and opposed to the government of God, and
yet that nothing but war releases us from its in-
fernal compact, that it is little short of atheism.
War waged on such principles cannot be attend-
ed with God's blessing.

Finally, as a government and people, we must
do justly, or die. God will endure us no longer
as a nation, if we mean to live by robbery and
oppression. This war is God's war for the op-
pressed, and if we will not take their part against
the oppressor, God will not take our part against
the rebellion. And now, what doth the Lord thy
God require of thee, BUT TO DO JUSTLY? Our
salvation is in our own power, if we do not just-
ly by the oppressed; if not, we perish. What we
conclude to do, and will do, by the slaves, deter-
mines what God will do by us. What we do by
the slaves determines the rebellion. All the
spread-eagles of liberty for ourselves and in-
divisible unity of the nation, will not help us, if
we admit the right to make slaves of others. The
boasted sovereign right of slavery is the sovereign
certainty of our own ruin.

We are doing the work of the Lord deceitfully,
and shall be guilty of the greatest hypocrisy that
ever degraded a nation, if now that we have pro-
claimed emancipation, we do not drive the war to
the fulfilment of that glorious edict; if we do not
actually declare and restore the millions who
we have declared free. We cannot draw back
from that position and break that covenant, ex-
cept at the expense of inevitable ruin as a nation.
If the proclamation of emancipation is a sham, if
we let it be regarded as such, if we suffer it to
lie, it will prove the most disastrous national
tragedy ever enacted upon earth. If we deliver
the enslaved, God will deliver us; if we desert
them, God will desert us. Let us trust in God,
and do justice, as his commission and command
in this terrible war, and God will bring out of it
our own national regeneration and salvation.

MAN'S WILL AND THE DIVINE WILL.

MAN'S AUTHORITY, AND THE DIVINE AUTHORITY.

MAN'S REASON, AND THE DIVINE REASON.

These three topics are closely connected. A
proper understanding of either one of them re-
quires that all three of them should be atten-
tively considered, and in their connexion with
relation to each other.

The Will is the active or propelling faculty.
More strictly, perhaps, we should rather say, it is
action itself.

Authority is needed, somewhere, by which the
will should be governed.
Reason, or, (more comprehensively,) Intelli-
gence, is a necessary attribute or pre-requisite of
authority. Intelligence, employed by Goodness,
is the proper guide of the Will, or Action. In-
telligence and Goodness, united with Power of
execution, are the elements of Authority.

In man, all these are, at least, imperfect, and
finite. This would be true, even if man were
created and ruled, as he is not. In the Divine
Being they are, forever perfect, infinite, and
spotless.

I. MAN'S WILL, AND THE DIVINE WILL.

By whose will ought man to be governed? By
the will of man? Or, by the will of his Creator?
This may seem a strange and a needless ques-
tion. But, strange as it may be, it is not a need-
less one. It is the question of questions—the
very question that lies at the bottom of nearly
all the disputes among men, concerning morals,
government, politics, theology, and religion.

Very seldom do we see or hear an important
question debated, without thinking that see it
resolved, ultimately, into this question: Who is
of right, supreme—God, or man? Whose will
shall prevail—the will of man or of his Maker?

The dispute concerning "the higher law" com-
monly so called, or more properly concerning
"the law" for valid real laws cannot conflict
with each other—it is simply a dispute whether the
will of God or the will of man should be held to
be of paramount authority, in communities.

The dispute concerning the rights of individual
conscience and of religious liberty, on the one
hand, and the authority of civil or ecclesiastical
governments, or of both combined, over the ex-
ercise of those rights, is simply a question whether
the authority of God, or of man, should be held
paramount.

Nothing can be more evident than that if any-
thing like "rights of conscience"—"inalienable
rights"—"equal rights"—and "rights of the people"
are to be respected and held inviolable, in opposi-
tion to the demands of despotic authority, it must
be on the principle that the will and authority of
God are paramount to the will and authority of
man. Accordingly we find our Declaration of
Independence reposing upon the idea that "all
men are endowed by their Creator with certain
"inalienable rights"—the obvious implication be-
ing that the authority of the Superior Power by
whom those rights were conferred is superior to
the authority of any other power on earth that
could deny or violate them; thus resting the en-
tire structure of "man's inalienable right to life,
liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" upon this
very idea, that the will of God is to be held pa-
ramount to the will of man. On the other hand,

those in this country who are now asserting the
inviolable and sacred authority of the Fugitive
Slave Bill, of the slave code, and of what they
call the legal and Constitutional rights of the
slaveholder, are found deriding and denouncing
what they call "the higher law doctrine" and
calling the self-evident truths of our Declaration of
Independence "a flourish of rhetoric" "glittering
generalizations" "a farfetched non-sense" or "a
self-evident lie." Even the corrupt and servile
clergy, who would make the Bible sanction sla-
very as well as the divine right of kings, and are
driven by their base business into the absurd
blasphemy of making Jehovah himself abdicate
the throne of his supremacy in favor of tyrants,
slave drivers, and man-stealers, authorizing them
to annul his statutes of equal love and impartial
justice by their own unrighteous decrees, and
bidding mankind obey them, instead of obeying
himself, thus bringing himself into subjection to
them, and making his authority auxiliary and
subordinate to theirs, for the worst purposes that
can be conceived!

The will of God, then, as paramount to the will
of man, is the only principle of security for man-
kind, in the relations of social life. Displace this
principle by that of the paramount supremacy of
the will of man, and you overturn the foundations
of social order, of protecting law, of just govern-
ment, and you install the reign of lawlessness, in
the form of despotism, or of anarchy, in its
stead.

Thus far the friends of freedom, and equal
rights, in this country, will accompany us, cor-
dially, no doubt, except the few, if there are any
such, who are ready to save themselves atheists,
and proclaim man to be his only law-giver, re-
sponsible to no Superior Being. On what
principles or by processes of reasoning a com-
munity of atheists could maintain and guard the
inviolability of human rights, is a problem that is
yet to be solved. The will of each, being supreme,
there could be, of course, no common empire be-
tween them, no source of a general law over
them all. If a civil government were attempted
in such a community, whether the government
of the few or of the many, it would be a govern-
ment without the guidance or the restraint of any wis-
dom or authority except its own, or of those,
whether few or many, who installed it. Its au-
thority, in like manner, would be self-assumed,
or could have no sacredness beyond that of its found-
ers. If any idea of justice were retained, it could
be only of a justice defined by temporary and
fluctuating estimates of utility, looking to the
promotion of supposed individual or partisan in-
terests, for the time being, interests confined to the
material and mundane, ignoring every thing
spiritual and permanent. The justice of to-day,
would be the injustice of to-morrow. Inherently,
inalienable rights as the corollary of absolute
immortality, eternal right, could have no abiding
place in man's mind. Self-will being everywhere,
there would be that which would secure the thing
for the time being desired. Man, being regarded
only in respect to his animal nature, would have
only the rights of a brute. In such a community,
might would stand for right. The law of the
stronger would be the only authority revered.
Many, would be the only authority revered.
Minorities would have no rights which the majori-
ty would feel bound to respect. Individuals
would have no rights at all. Faction would suc-
ceed to faction, each annihilating its conquered
rival, itself to be annihilated in its turn. This is
neither theory nor imagination. It is historical
verity. Such was the reign of Atheism in France
proclaiming "No monarch in heaven"—"Death
an eternal sleep"—its symbol the guillotine, its
protection, promiscuous carnage, its trophies,
rivers of human blood.

We settle it, then, that the idea of the will of
God, supreme and paramount over the will of
man, is the only security for communities of men.
The only basis of civil and religious liberty, of
civil government, of protecting law.

II. MAN'S AUTHORITY, AND THE DIVINE AUTHORITY.

But the supremacy of the will of God over the
will of man, the public authorities, will never be
recognized in communities that do not as individ-
uals, recognize and welcome the idea of the
supremacy of the will of God over themselves,
as individuals, and the subjection to their will to
his will, as their lawful director and governor.

This proposition is too evident to require proof.
But it is important to ponder this idea of the
supremacy of the will of God over the will of
man, with sufficient attention and reflection to
perceive clearly wherein it consists, and what it
implies and involves, in order that we may be
able duly impressed with its solemnity and im-
portance.

The subjection of the will of man to the will of
God is the subordination of our purposes to his
purposes, our desires to his desires, our plans to
his plans, our aims to his aims. Wherever there
is a conflict between them it is to give up ours for
his. It has been often and with propriety expres-
sed as the surrendering of our wills to be swallow-
ed up in the Divine Will;—as having, as it were,
of our own, as distinct from, or as not in
harmony with his. It is to make his will our
law, our guide, in all the aims and activities of
life, to do what he commands, and avoid what he
forbids.

Submission to the Divine authority as para-
mount to man's authority, is thus to subordinate
our wills to the Divine will, to swallow up our
wills in his, from a filial reverence to him, as our
Creator, our law-giver, our final Judge. The idea
of the Divine law, involves the idea of a divinely
appointed penalty for the violation of that law.

A cordial recognition of all this is involved, of
necessity, in the idea of man's recognition of the
Divine authority, and of the supremacy of that
authority over the authority of man. Where any
one of these elements is wanting, the recognition
of the Divine authority is incomplete.

If we, next, inquire into the grounds or reason-
ableness of this subjection of man's will to the
Divine will—the subjection of communities and
of individuals, our minds naturally revert to con-
siderations like these. God is our Creator—we
are his creatures. God is our preserver—we are
completely dependent upon him. He is infinite—
we are finite. He exists from Eternity—we are
of yesterday. He has all power, and his power is
undivided—We are feeble, and the little power
we have is from him. He knows all things, sees
all things, understands all things, comprehends
all things, remembers all the past, foresees all the
future. In his hands are our destinies. We know
little we do know is communicated by him. All
we can hereafter learn must be learned from him.
Our reason, our intelligence, all our powers are
his gift, a comparatively dim ray of light from

his Infinite Intelligence. He is infinitely and
unchangably good, the perfection of wisdom,
purity, justice, mercy, impartial and disinterested
benevolence. These constitute his will. His will
is identical with his law. It is perfect in right-
eousness. It is holy, just and good.

We know that it is not thus with ourselves.
We are selfish, partial, proud, and we are trans-
gressors of the Divine law, the law of our being,
at variance with one another and with ourselves,
condemned by one another and by our own con-
science. What further considerations are needed
to show us why the will of man should be subor-
dinated to the will of God, his Creator—why the
Authority of God should forever be held para-
mount to the authority of man?

A crowd of reflections and inferences from
these plain, homely truths press upon us, just
here. From these outlines, hastily sketched,
there branch out innumerable truths. Volumes
of Theology, of Ethics, of Political Science might
be deduced, very naturally, and readily from them.
We select but a single topic—the remaining one
at the head of this article, and still requiring
distinct consideration. It is the relation between

III. MAN'S REASON, AND THE DIVINE REASON.

If man's will as compared with the Divine will
—if man's authority, as compared with the Divine
authority—stand, in their relation to each other
as we have described them to stand, then what
relation does the reason of man sustain to the
Divine reason?

If man's will should be subordinated to the
Divine will—if man's authority should give place
to the Divine Authority, then why should not
man's Reason be held inferior in authority to the
Divine reason? How can we affirm the two former
without affirming the latter? Is not the latter
only having gotten into war, that we had the
involved in the two former? Would not a denial
of the latter involve a denial of the two former?

Let us try the experiment and see. Suppose
then, we should say that man's reason is not to be
held inferior and subordinate to the Divine reason?
Or, in other words, suppose we should affirm, as
some do, the all-sufficiency of human reason to
guide men, in matters of morals, religion, govern-
ment, and Theology; of faith and of practice,
without any additional revelation from God?

If this statement were in accordance with truth,
how could it then be affirmed, with good reason,
that the authority of man, in matters of morals,
religion, government, and theology, should be
held inferior and subordinate, to the authority of
God? If man's reason be sufficient for man's
guidance and government, what guidance or gov-
ernment would be need from a superior being? If
it were sufficient, how could its requirements
differ from the Divine requirements? And what
occasion or opportunity would ever be presented,
of setting aside the human authority for the di-
vine?

Nay, if man, by mere exercise of his own
reason were thus competent, to self-direction and
there be in his being placed under the govern-
ment and control of another Being?

In answer to this it may perhaps be alleged
that man's will is not always controlled by
his reason, but the reverse—that men do not
exercise their reason as they might do, nor fol-
low its dictates as they ought—that pride, pre-
judice, passion, appetite, inclination, habit, or
apparent self interest often becloud the reason,
or are mistaken for it, or overpower its plain
dictates—and that these considerations render it
impossible to subordinate the will of man to the
will of God, and to hold the human authority
subject and inferior to the Divine.

But this answer, however truthful in its facts,
and legitimate in its inferences, does not sub-
serve the end for which it is adduced—does not
disprove the insufficiency of human reason, with-
out a superadded revelation of the Divine will,
to guide men, in the responsibilities, obligations,
and duties of life, which go to make up the sub-
stance of morality and religion. Instead of dis-
proving this, it helps to prove it, as may readily
be shown.

Those who bring forward this argument, do
so at the expense of their own self-consistency,
and in opposition to a fundamental article in
their own creed. Those who hold the all-suffi-
ciency of human reason for the purposes of
human guidance, are the same persons who deny
the depravity of the human will, the tyranny of
man's passions over their reason, the subjugation
of man's nobler powers, by the baser instincts of
his nature. And when confronted, in argument,
on this point, with the stubborn facts of man's
moral history, the records of his vices and his
crimes, they always deny that this is owing to
the wickedness of men's hearts, and affirm that it
is to be charged only to their limited intelligence,
their ignorance, their miseducation, that is, the
ignorance of their parents, the ignorance and
superstition (they will hardly admit the wickedness)
of their ancestors and teachers, the leaders of
public sentiment, the recognized wisest and best
of their species! They seem to pay, but a sorry
compliment to the all-sufficiency reason of mankind,
that they are even degrading it below the stand-
ard admitted and held by those who, unlike
themselves, believe in the necessity of a divine
revelation, in addition to the light of reason. So
far is this plea of human ignorance and mental
inability carried that, on the strength of it, the
moral responsibilities of mankind are virtually
denied, their incapacity of contracting guilt or
of deserving punishment. One of the most
strenuous modern advocates of the all-sufficiency
of human reason for human guidance in religion
and morals, has been equally distinguished for
his systematic efforts to displace the ideas of
sin, guilt, ill-desert, and punishment, properly
called, and as commonly understood, by repre-
senting that what men are called sin, wicked-
ness, vice, and crime, involve little or no moral
obligation or corruption of heart, but are re-
garded as the unavoidable and necessary
stumbles and falls of poor ignorant, inexperi-
enced, imbecile, infantile human nature, only just
beginning to walk, and doing the very best it
knows how to do! On one page, the godlike
reason of man is extolled as elevating him to a
divinity, knowing good and evil, and needing no
revelations of the Divine will. On the next page,
this godlike being is represented as too weak,
feeble, imbecile, and ignorant, to be held to any
rigid and strict account for his misdoings!

If it be said that man's reason, being the gift
of God, for the purpose of human guidance, be-
comes, itself, the sole revelation of the Divine
Reason to man, inasmuch that he needs no super-
added revelation; the argument proves, too
much. It proves what is contrary to fact. We
see and know that man's reason is not an ade-
quate and all-sufficient light for his guidance. The
disputations of the wisest and best men, on the

most plain and vital practical questions, afford
ample refutation of the statement.

Not only so; there is another consideration
that enables us to detect the fallacy. It proves
too much, by proving a gross absurdity, in this,
that it supposes the infinite Creator to have en-
dowed the finite creature, who came into exist-
ence but yesterday, with the fulness of his own
unlimited knowledge and wisdom, so that thence-
forward, being thus gifted with the plenitude of
the Divine intelligence, man knows as much as
his Maker knows—in other words, that man is
the equal of his Maker, that the finite is trans-
formed into the Infinite—"Ye shall become as
gods"—said the tempter. To listen to the tempta-
tion is to fall from obedience to the Supreme
law-giver. It is to renounce the Divine Author-
ity—to set up the human will against the Divine
will.

So long as man is to be the subject and the
servant of God, as long will man need a revela-
tion of God's will, in addition to his own will,
to guide him, in the Divine service.

Man, in the employ and service of his fellow-
man, his equal in intelligence, finds it necessary
to seek and obtain instructions in respect to the
kind and manner of service to be performed.
What would you think of your hired servant,
who, on

"THE CONSTITUTION AS IT IS."

For the Principia.
 Brother Goodell:—In the National Democratic Convention, at Syracuse, N. Y., August 23d, 1865, the party said these noble words:
 "It is the mission of the Democracy to proclaim and maintain the great principles of civil and religious LIBERTY, and to uphold and enforce the CONSTITUTION, in its sublime principle of Justice and Equality."

We never expected that, in any of our most radical Liberty Party conventions, in Central and Western New York, let us come up with more zeal to help "the Democracy" to accomplish its "mission." To do this, we must uphold "the Constitution as it is."

Yours, earnestly, for such a work,
 J. R. JOHNSON.

CHESAPE, Mass., March 17, 1863.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1863.

AGENTS FOR THE PRINCIPIA.

REV. M. B. WILLIAMS, New-York City
 F. O. IRISH, New-York City
 JOHN W. MOORE, Lockport, N. Y.
 A. L. STRYKER, Java Village, N. Y.
 E. L. WHITNEY, New-York
 W. R. STONE, Cortland, N. Y.
 J. UNDERHILL, Oseco, Mich.
 N. J. COGSWELL, East Springhill, Pa.
 WILLIAM CALDWELL, Hickory, Pa.
 REV. CHARLES CHANDLER, Paxton, Ill.
 JONATHAN LAW, Walcott's Mills, Ind.
 GEORGE W. LIGHT, Boston, Mass., city and vicinity.
 JOHN MCCOMBE, Worcester, Mass.
 EDITHA GALTIN, Flint, Mich.
 T. M. CHISHOLM, New Bedford, Ms.
 M. W. WHITTELL, and A. A. SMITH, Salem, Mass., and vicinity.

REV. THOMAS W. JONES, Augusta, Mich.
 AUGUST CASTLE, Washington, Ill.
 SAMUEL MATTHEWS, Mahoning, Pa.
 W. O. HOGGENTHAL, Grand Rapids, Mich.
 T. G. WHITE, Geddes, N. Y.
 WILLIAM A. PLANT, Marcellus, N. Y.
 REV. ANSON H. STEARNS, Peterboro, N. Y.
 J. A. WATERS, Union, Mich.
 JOHN N. CHAFFIN, Augusta, Me.
 JAMES BOYD, Keene, Ohio.
 SILAS SMITH, West Albany, Vt.
 REV. DANIEL SHUCK, Hartsville, Vt.
 TITUS C. BRIGGS, Williams Center, Ohio.
 FREDERICK HARTZELL, Smithfield, Ohio.
 DE. J. H. CARTER, Burlington, Vt.
 DR. JOHN S. C. MURRAY, Travelling Agent.
 A. LEONARD, Jacksonville, Mich.
 REV. H. MCNEELY, Brandon, Wis.
 REV. JAMES MCKENNEY, Danby, Ill.
 C. G. CORWIN, Magee's Corners, N. Y.
 HENRY W. SMITH, Scottsville, Pa.
 GEO. COFFIN, Ludlow, Vt.
 REV. S. E. BAIRD, Georgia, Vt.
 REV. J. B. DAWSON, West Alexander, Pa.
 STEPHEN A. ALLEN, Adrian, Mich.
 EDWARD HALE, Tallmadge, Ohio.
 JAMES JEFFREY, Honesville, O.
 REV. WILLIAM RICE, Strongsville, O.
 M. R. HILL, Dublin, Ind.
 REV. L. L. ADAMS, Leavenworth City, Kansas.

CLARK ORVIS, Thompson Station, Long Island, N. Y.

REV. A. G. BEMAN, New Haven, Ct.

ADAM KEYS, Jordan's Grove, Ill.

JOHN KELLY, Stephen's Mills, N. Y.

DEA. GEORGE DAVIS, Thompson, Conn.

ELIAS TETERICK, Winchester, Ohio.

R. G. PATTON, Peoria, Ill.

ROBERT WATSON, Martinsburg, Ohio.

WILLIAM McCLELL, Northfield, Iowa.

B. M. SPALDING, South Albany, Vt.

WILLIAM D. LOWERY, Calais, Ohio.

WILLIAM B. ALEXANDER, Centerville, Iowa.

W. W. MERRILL, Oberlin, Ohio.

REV. T. B. MCKENNEY, Princeton, Ind.

W. A. NICKERSON, Sycamore, Ill.

ONE HUNDRED AGENTS WANTED!

To canvass for subscribers for this paper, to whom liberal commission will be paid. Apply to the Publisher, 104 William St., New York, or address by mail.

J. W. ALDEN, Box 4381, N. Y.

"CONTINGENT FUND."

This fund is for the circulation of the Principia among the soldiers, officers, and chaplains of our army—missionaries in the southern and western fields—and ministers of the gospel, who will act as agents in extending the circulation of the paper.

Those who contribute are requested to state to which of the above classes they wish their funds applied, or whether they will have it discretion with the Trustees.

All donations will be acknowledged through the mail, and receipts for the paper sent to the parties with the donor's name in every case, when practicable.

J. W. ALDEN, Treasurer and Publisher.

"THE WAR."

ON

The Princeton Review Reviewed.

—In the light of its own theology and ethics.

NO. II.

The public conscience touched—The Princeton Review's anatomy.

We have published extracts from the Princeton Review's article on "THE WAR," in which it was said:

"This war touches the conscience in too many points to render silence, on the part of religious men, either allowable or possible. There never was a time when the public conscience was more disturbed, or when it was more necessary that moral principles, in their bearing on national conduct, should be brought to the attention of the people."

This testimony is true, and the inference drawn from it is most legitimate. The public conscience is disturbed. From one end of the loyal States to the other, this disturbance of the public conscience has been manifested in the utterance of solemn convictions that God is now dealing with us for our national sins—especially for our great national sin of which, as the world knows, we are deeply guilty. These convictions have found expression in the public press—not the anti-slavery press alone, nor exclusively the religious press. Regular journals, in city and country, from Maine to Kansas and Missouri, have given utterance to them. Soon after the retreat from Bull Run, the land rang with notes like these:

"God's terms for aiding our army are very distinctly stated—'Break every yoke, let the oppressed go free.' This warfare is a one price estate. God never takes less for his blessings or his aid than the first named rate."

Said another,

"It is useless labor to patch up a peace, where the consciences and instincts of the inhabitants compel them to disregard it." It is excessively painful to be stipulating that we shall respect a state of society, which has for its object, in defiance of God, to grow men as brutes."

Said another,

"The masses see that the war is a war for slavery, and that (quoting the words of Jefferson), 'the Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with the oppressor.' They appeal to the God of our fathers, who hates oppression, and are bucking on the armor, for the conflict."

Said another,

"God will give us no peace, until we let the oppressed go free. Until then, all his attributes are against us."

There never was a time when the public conscience was more disturbed, or when it was more necessary that moral principles, in their bearing on national conduct, should be brought to the attention of the people."

How has the *Principia* Review, as a religious teacher, fulfilled this high mission? Has it reminded the nation of its rulers that the will of God, as revealed by the light of nature, and the Scriptures, binds nations and their rulers to the protection of all their innocent and loyal inhabitants? That it forbids all protection of oppressors in their oppressions, all complicity with, or tolerance of oppression? That Government is an ordinance of God for the execution of equal and impartial justice between man and man; that in the neglect of this duty, God has often threatened nations with punishment, and even extinction? That he has repeatedly fulfilled these threatenings, declaring, afterward, that it was for this cause that he overthrew them, thus fixing it as a principle of his moral government over the nations, to all time—a principle corroborated by the world's history?

No, nothing in this direction appears in the *Principia* Review. Instead of it, we see an elaborate attempt to produce, upon the minds of the people and rulers of this nation, a diametrically opposite impression. The labor of the writer is expended in insinuating, if not directly affirming, that "the war" is a divine chastisement or punishment for our national sins—either the sin of oppression or any other sin—that it is entirely unevangelical and unorthodox to think so. Anything like humiliation, confession, and repentance for our national sins, in consideration of the terrible visitation now resting upon us, (it is left to be inferred), is altogether out of place and uncalled for. The writer does not even suggest the propriety of inquiring whether or not our national calamity may not effect the punishment of our national sins. The tendency of the article, as a whole, is to quiet all such conscientious misgivings, and to put at rest all such inquiries.

This newest of new Theologies, from the central seat of Old School Theology, at Princeton, deserves scrutiny in the light of God's word. We shall recur to the subject again, remarking only for the present, the singular inconsistency of the Review, in recognizing the binding authority of the first place, the will of God, over the nations, and then indulging in a course of reasonings, the only possible effect of which must be to suggest doubts whether God exercises any moral government over the nations at all. Some sermons have been justly criticised as having been constructed for the purpose of explaining away the text at the head of them. Of others it has been quickly said that if their texts had had the small-pox, they never would have caught it from them. So we say of the starting points of the Reviewer's article on the war, when contrasted with the most elaborate portion of the article itself.

To work at slavery in a portion of the Republic is to sow the seeds of rebellion broadcast over the land. It was a dangerous and wicked practice.

Said another—(a statesman),

"Every man must perish in order that Christianity and the institutions of liberty may be preserved."

Said another,

"If the nation would have God's help in restoring its flag, let it render him help in restoring to the bondmen their rights."

When our soldiers went out to win the victory at Winchey-fight, their watch-word was Religion. Can we, in our great struggle for liberty and right, adopt any other watch-word than this? Do we require another defeat, and more suffering to our arms, but with a very different result to God, for the conduct and for the issue of this war?

Said another,

"What are we to do, about the coming fast day? It is certainly a time for national fasting and prayer. But when I read the inspired description of an acceptable fast, (Isaiah 58, 3-12, especially verse 9) I do not see the way clear."

Said another,

"I again give it as my opinion that we must come to this one point, that of the liberation of the slaves. Before God will give us success."

Said another—in reference to the Fast,

"There then is a difficulty. The Government cannot command the prayers of the people of God, for the success of the policy it has adopted. The thing is impossible. Christians will pray for the success of our arms, but they will pray for a different issue of battle in their minds, from that proposed at Washington."

Said another,

"While we retain the universally acknowledged cause of our national evils, negro slavery, the legitimate effects thereof will not cease, though we were to fast till our bones stand out, and pray till our tongues cleave to the roof of our mouths."

Said another,

"Instead of obeying the voice of God, the dictates of humanity, and a wise righteous policy, in liberating the enslaved, we offer freedom to slaves on the most expensive conditions, our own blood being the price."

Said another,

"We should put away the sins which have brought down the wrath of God upon us. God will not remove his hand until we mend our ways."

Said another,

"If God be just he will blight, not bless such a Government."

Said the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Illinois,

"In the judgment of this Synod, the great Jehovah is the Supreme Ruler over the nations of the earth, and his law is supreme over all constitutions and laws. The nation has sinned in refusing to recognize, practically, this great principle—the principle of liberty."

THE WORD OF GOD.

Can any one deny that these utterances are in accordance with the messages of God, by the Old Testament prophets? Would not a denial of this be equivalent to a denial of the inspiration of those Scriptures? Can it be questioned that such utterances of confession are indications of an awakened conscience, in the light of God's word, giving hopeful signs of national repentance and amendment? As such, have they not been welcomed by intelligent and devout Christians, in both hemispheres?

THE PRINCETON REVIEWERS IN TROUBLE.

"The article in the *Principia* Review affords evidence that it was not written in ignorance of these sentiments, nor in a state of indifference concerning them."

"We can hardly take up a religious journal," says the Review, "without being struck with some of its manifestations." p. 140.

But was it for the purpose of deepening those religious convictions and confession of sin in the nation, with a view of leading it to repentance, amendment, and the forsaking of its great national sin, that the article in the *Principia* Review was written and published? Is there a single sentence in this manifesto, in fact, beginning to end? Or is its manifest tendency and apparent object precisely the reverse—to lay the consciences of the people and their rulers asleep, under the thunderings of the Divine dealings? We shall see as we proceed.

But, along side of its admission that the public conscience of the nation had been deeply touched by the war, and in a direction greatly to the annoyance, as well as to the peril of the *Principia* Review, as we know, at the North and at the South, since its far-famed utterance of 1836, as the Biblical defender or apologist of slavery, the steady opponent of abolition, let us place its admission that

"God's terms for aiding our army are very distinctly stated—'Break every yoke, let the oppressed go free.' This warfare is a one price estate. God never takes less for his blessings or his aid than the first named rate."

Said another,

"It is useless labor to patch up a peace, where the consciences and instincts of the inhabitants compel them to disregard it." It is excessively painful to be stipulating that we shall respect a state of society, which has for its object, in defiance of God, to grow men as brutes."

Said another,

"The masses see that the war is a war for slavery, and that (quoting the words of Jefferson), 'the Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with the oppressor.' They appeal to the God of our fathers, who hates oppression, and are bucking on the armor, for the conflict."

Said another,

"God will give us no peace, until we let the oppressed go free. Until then, all his attributes are against us."

There never was a time when the public conscience was more disturbed, or when it was more necessary that moral principles, in their bearing on national conduct, should be brought to the attention of the people."

How has the *Principia* Review, as a religious teacher, fulfilled this high mission? Has it reminded the nation of its rulers that the will of God, as revealed by the light of nature, and the Scriptures, binds nations and their rulers to the protection of all their innocent and loyal inhabitants? That it forbids all protection of oppressors in their oppressions, all complicity with, or tolerance of oppression? That Government is an ordinance of God for the execution of equal and impartial justice between man and man; that in the neglect of this duty, God has often threatened nations with punishment, and even extinction? That he has repeatedly fulfilled these threatenings, declaring, afterward, that it was for this cause that he overthrew them, thus fixing it as a principle of his moral government over the nations, to all time—a principle corroborated by the world's history?

No, nothing in this direction appears in the *Principia* Review. Instead of it, we see an elaborate attempt to produce, upon the minds of the people and rulers of this nation, a diametrically opposite impression. The labor of the writer is expended in insinuating, if not directly affirming, that "the war" is a divine chastisement or punishment for our national sins—either the sin of oppression or any other sin—that it is entirely unevangelical and unorthodox to think so. Anything like humiliation, confession, and repentance for our national sins, in consideration of the terrible visitation now resting upon us, (it is left to be inferred), is altogether out of place and uncalled for. The writer does not even suggest the propriety of inquiring whether or not our national calamity may not effect the punishment of our national sins. The tendency of the article, as a whole, is to quiet all such conscientious misgivings, and to put at rest all such inquiries.

This newest of new Theologies, from the central seat of Old School Theology, at Princeton, deserves scrutiny in the light of God's word. We shall recur to the subject again, remarking only for the present, the singular inconsistency of the Review, in recognizing the binding authority of the first place, the will of God, over the nations, and then indulging in a course of reasonings, the only possible effect of which must be to suggest doubts whether God exercises any moral government over the nations at all. Some sermons have been justly criticised as having been constructed for the purpose of explaining away the text at the head of them. Of others it has been quickly said that if their texts had had the small-pox, they never would have caught it from them. So we say of the starting points of the Reviewer's article on the war, when contrasted with the most elaborate portion of the article itself.

To work at slavery in a portion of the Republic is to sow the seeds of rebellion broadcast over the land. It was a dangerous and wicked practice.

Said another—(a statesman),

"Every man must perish in order that Christianity and the institutions of liberty may be preserved."

Said another,

"If the nation would have God's help in restoring its flag, let it render him help in restoring to the bondmen their rights."

When our soldiers went out to win the victory at Winchey-fight, their watch-word was Religion. Can we, in our great struggle for liberty and right, adopt any other watch-word than this? Do we require another defeat, and more suffering to our arms, but with a very different result to God, for the conduct and for the issue of this war?

Said another,

"What are we to do, about the coming fast day? It is certainly a time for national fasting and prayer. But when I read the inspired description of an acceptable fast, (Isaiah 58, 3-12, especially verse 9) I do not see the way clear."

Said another,

"I again give it as my opinion that we must come to this one point, that of the liberation of the slaves. Before God will give us success."

Said another—in reference to the Fast,

"There then is a difficulty. The Government cannot command the prayers of the people of God, for the success of the policy it has adopted. The thing is impossible. Christians will pray for the success of our arms, but they will pray for a different issue of battle in their minds, from that proposed at Washington."

Said another,

"While we retain the universally acknowledged cause of our national evils, negro slavery, the legitimate effects thereof will not cease, though we were to fast till our bones stand out, and pray till our tongues cleave to the roof of our mouths."

Said another,

"Instead of obeying the voice of God, the dictates of humanity, and a wise righteous policy, in liberating the enslaved, we offer freedom to slaves on the most expensive conditions, our own blood being the price."

Said another,

"We should put away the sins which have brought down the wrath of God upon us. God will not remove his hand until we mend our ways."

Said another,

"If God be just he will blight, not bless such a Government."

Said the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Illinois,

"In the judgment of this Synod, the great Jehovah is the Supreme Ruler over the nations of the earth, and his law is supreme over all constitutions and laws. The nation has sinned in refusing to recognize, practically, this great principle—the principle of liberty."

THE WORD OF GOD.

Can any one deny that these utterances are in accordance with the messages of God, by the Old Testament prophets? Would not a denial of this be equivalent to a denial of the inspiration of those Scriptures? Can it be questioned that such utterances of confession are indications of an awakened conscience, in the light of God's word, giving hopeful signs of national repentance and amendment? As such, have they not been welcomed by intelligent and devout Christians, in both hemispheres?

THE PRINCETON REVIEWERS IN TROUBLE.

"The article in the *Principia* Review affords evidence that it was not written in ignorance of these sentiments, nor in a state of indifference concerning them."

"We can hardly take up a religious journal," says the Review, "without being struck with some of its manifestations." p. 140.

But was it for the purpose of deepening those religious convictions and confession of sin in the nation, with a view of leading it to repentance, amendment, and the forsaking of its great national sin, that the article in the *Principia* Review was written and published? Is there a single sentence in this manifesto, in fact, beginning to end? Or is its manifest tendency and apparent object precisely the reverse—to lay the consciences of the people and their rulers asleep, under the thunderings of the Divine dealings? We shall see as we proceed.

But, along side of its admission that the public conscience of the nation had been deeply touched by the war, and in a direction greatly to the annoyance, as well as to the peril of the *Principia* Review, as we know, at the North and at the South, since its far-famed utterance of 1836, as the Biblical defender or apologist of slavery, the steady opponent of abolition, let us place its admission that

"God's terms for aiding our army are very distinctly stated—'Break every yoke, let the oppressed go free.' This warfare is a one price estate. God never takes less for his blessings or his aid than the first named rate."

Said another,

"It is useless labor to patch up a peace, where the consciences and instincts of the inhabitants compel them to disregard it." It is excessively painful to be stipulating that we shall respect a state of society, which has for its object, in defiance of God, to grow men as brutes."

Said another,

"The masses see that the war is a war for slavery, and that (quoting the words of Jefferson), 'the Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with the oppressor.' They appeal to the God of our fathers, who hates oppression, and are bucking on the armor, for the conflict."

Said another,

"God will give us no peace, until we let the oppressed go free. Until then, all his attributes are against us."

There never was a time when the public conscience was more disturbed, or when it was more necessary that moral principles, in their bearing on national conduct, should be brought to the attention of the people."

How has the *Principia* Review, as a religious teacher, fulfilled this high mission? Has it reminded the nation of its rulers that the will of God, as revealed by the light of nature, and the Scriptures, binds nations and their rulers to the protection of all their innocent and loyal inhabitants? That it forbids all protection of oppressors in their oppressions, all complicity with, or tolerance of oppression? That Government is an ordinance of God for the execution of equal and impartial justice between man and man; that in the neglect of this duty, God has often threatened nations with punishment, and even extinction? That he has repeatedly fulfilled these threatenings, declaring, afterward, that it was for this cause that he overthrew them, thus fixing it as a principle of his moral government over the nations, to all time—a principle corroborated by the world's history?

No, nothing in this direction appears in the *Principia* Review. Instead of it, we see an elaborate attempt to produce, upon the minds of the people and rulers of this nation, a diametrically opposite impression. The labor of the writer is expended in insinuating, if not directly affirming, that "the war" is a divine chastisement or punishment for our national sins—either the sin of oppression or any other sin—that it is entirely unevangelical and unorthodox to think so. Anything like humiliation, confession, and repentance for our national sins, in consideration of the terrible visitation now resting upon us, (it is left to be inferred), is altogether out of place and uncalled for. The writer does not even suggest the propriety of inquiring whether or not our national calamity may not effect the punishment of our national sins. The tendency of the article, as a whole, is to quiet all such conscientious misgivings, and to put at rest all such inquiries.

This newest of new Theologies, from the central seat of Old School Theology, at Princeton, deserves scrutiny in the light of God's word. We shall recur to the subject again, remarking only for the present, the singular inconsistency of the Review, in recognizing the binding authority of the first place, the will of God, over the nations, and then indulging in a course of reasonings, the only possible effect of which must be to suggest doubts whether God exercises any moral government over the nations at all. Some sermons have been justly criticised as having been constructed for the purpose of explaining away the text at the head of them. Of others it has been quickly said that if their texts had had the small-pox, they never would have caught it from them. So we say of the starting points of the Reviewer's article on the war, when contrasted with the most elaborate portion of the article itself.

To work at slavery in a portion of the Republic is to sow the seeds of rebellion broadcast over the land. It was a dangerous and wicked practice.

Said another—(a statesman),

"Every man must perish in order that Christianity and the institutions of liberty may be preserved."

Said another,

"If the nation would have God's help in restoring its flag, let it render him help in restoring to the bondmen their rights."

When our soldiers went out to win the victory at Winchey-fight, their watch-word was Religion. Can we, in our great struggle for liberty and right, adopt any other watch-word than this? Do we require another defeat, and more suffering to our arms, but with a very different result to God, for the conduct and for the issue of this war?

Said another,

"What are we to do, about the coming fast day? It is certainly a time for national fasting and prayer. But when I read the inspired description of an acceptable fast, (Isaiah 58, 3-12, especially verse 9) I do not see the way clear."

Said another,

"I again give it as my opinion that we must come to this one point, that of the liberation of the slaves. Before God will give us success."

Said another—in reference to the Fast,

"There then is a difficulty. The Government cannot command the prayers of the people of God, for the success of the policy it has adopted. The thing is impossible. Christians will pray for the success of our arms, but they will pray for a different issue of battle in their minds, from that proposed at Washington."

Said another,

"While we retain the universally acknowledged cause of our national evils, negro slavery, the legitimate effects thereof will not cease, though we were to fast till our bones stand out, and pray till our tongues cleave to the roof of our mouths."

Said another,

"Instead of obeying the voice of God, the dictates of humanity, and a wise righteous policy, in liberating the enslaved, we offer freedom to slaves on the most expensive conditions, our own blood being the price."

Said another,

"We should put away the sins which have brought down the wrath of God upon us. God will not remove his hand until we mend our ways."

Said another,

"If God be just he will blight, not bless such a Government."

Said the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church in Illinois,

"In the judgment of this Synod, the great Jehovah is the Supreme Ruler over the nations of the earth, and his law is supreme over all constitutions and laws. The nation has sinned in refusing to recognize, practically, this great principle—the principle of liberty."

THE WORD OF GOD.

Can any one deny that these utterances are in accordance with the messages of God, by the Old Testament prophets? Would not a denial of this be equivalent to a denial of the inspiration of those Scriptures? Can it be questioned that such utterances of confession are indications of an awakened conscience, in the light of God's word, giving hopeful signs of national repentance and amendment? As such, have they not been welcomed by intelligent and devout Christians, in both hemispheres?

THE PRINCETON REVIEWERS IN TROUBLE.

